



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/756,641	01/03/2001	David Proulx	0007056-0062/P5334NP/ARG	7529
26263	7590	02/11/2005	EXAMINER	
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP			SCHLAIFER, JONATHAN D	
P.O. BOX 061080			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER				
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080			2178	

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/756,641	PROULX ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Jonathan D. Schlaifer	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2004.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4,6-11,13-18,20 and 21 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-4,6-11,13-18,20 and 21 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 03 January 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to an Amendment to application 09/756,641 filed on 8/24/2004.
2. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20-21 are pending in the case. Claims 1,7, 8, 14, 15, and 21 were amended and claims 5, 12, and 19 were cancelled. Claims 1, 8 and 15 are independent claims.
3. The rejections of claims 7, 14, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, are withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
4. The rejections of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 101 are withdrawn as necessitated by amendment

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 15, and 20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fein et al. (USPN 6,088,711—filing date 7/1/1997), hereinafter Fein.**
6. **Regarding independent claim 1, Fein discloses a method in a data processing system (col. 1 of the patent describes how word processing documents are stored, which occurs in a data processing system) comprising: storing a set of styles associated with a word processing document (storing styles is described in col. 1, lines 25-35) in a first record**

(this is an inherent part of storing the styles, as they must be stored in a record and it is the first such record referred to); storing a set of text information associated with said word processing document (the text is marked with styles in col. 1, lines 25-50; this inherently requires storing the text); and storing a set of linking information that links said set of text information and said set of styles (the text is marked with styles in col. 1, lines 25-50; this inherently requires storing linking information).

7. **Regarding dependent claim 6,** Fein implies storing said set of text information and said set of linking information in one or more second records (see col. 1, lines 50-55, the document is associated with a template, which implies storing the text and linking information in order to bring about the association.)
8. **Regarding independent claim 8,** it is a word processing document compactor that performs the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.
9. **Regarding dependent claim 13,** it is a word processing document compactor that performs the method of claim 6, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.
10. **Regarding independent claim 15,** it is a computer program product that performs the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.
11. **Regarding independent claim 20,** it is a computer program product that performs the method of claim 6, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 12. Claims 2-4, 9-11, and 16-18 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fein, further in view of Microsoft Corporation, Microsoft Word: User's Guide, 1993-1994, Microsoft Corporation, Version 6.0, Pages 114 and 133, hereinafter Microsoft Corporation.**
- 13. Regarding dependent claim 2,** Fein fails to disclose that said set of styles is divided into a first gallery and a second gallery. However, Microsoft Corporation, on pages 114 and 133, reveals that style for Microsoft Word is manipulated via two galleries, Paragraph and Font. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used two galleries in the manner of Microsoft Word in the invention Fein because this is a more convenient, logically designed scheme for the user, because Paragraph formatting options and Font formatting options were grouped that way in Microsoft Word because they affect different scope levels of the document.
- 14. Regarding dependent claim 3,** Fein fails to disclose that said set of styles is divided into a first gallery and a second gallery. However, Microsoft Corporation, on pages 114 and 133, reveals that style for Microsoft Word is manipulated via two galleries, Paragraph and Font. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used a first Paragraph gallery in Fein in the manner of Microsoft Word because this is a convenient, logically designed scheme for the user as indicated in the rejection for claim 2.
- 15. Regarding dependent claim 4,** Fein fails to disclose that said set of styles is divided into a first gallery and a second gallery. However, Microsoft Corporation, on pages 114 and

133, reveals that style for Microsoft Word is manipulated via two galleries, Paragraph and Font. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used a second Font (text style) gallery in Fein in the manner of Microsoft Word because this is a convenient, logically designed scheme for the user as indicated in the rejection for claim 2.

16. **Regarding dependent claim 9**, it is a word processing document compactor that performs the method of claim 2, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.
17. **Regarding dependent claim 10**, it is a word processing document compactor that performs the method of claim 3, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.
18. **Regarding dependent claim 11**, it is a word processing document compactor that performs the method of claim 4, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.
19. **Regarding dependent claim 16**, it is a computer program product that performs the method of claim 2, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.
20. **Regarding dependent claim 17**, it is a computer program product that performs the method of claim 3, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.
21. **Regarding dependent claim 18**, it is a computer program product that performs the method of claim 4, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.
22. **Claim 7, 14, and 21 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fein**
23. **Regarding dependent claim 7**, Fein fails to explicitly disclose that the set of text information comprises: one or more multi-byte characters. However, it was notoriously well-known that multi-byte schemes such as Unicode could have been used to represent

characters in order to increase the richness of character representation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used multi-byte schemes such as Unicode to represent characters in order to increase the richness of character representation.

24. **Regarding dependent claim 14**, it is a word processing document compactor that performs the method of claim 7, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.
25. **Regarding dependent claim 21**, it is a computer program product that performs the method of claim 7, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

***Response to Arguments***

26. Applicant's arguments filed 8/24/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
27. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's arguments regarding claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 15, 19 and 20. The Applicant argues that Fein does not disclose, explicitly or implicitly, that the storage of the styles occurs in a first record. As noted in the rejection, Fein stores styles, and this inherently must occur in a first record because data is stored by data processing systems in records and this is the first record referred to by the claim. For this reason, the rejection is valid.
28. The Examiner notes because claims 1, 8, and 15 remain unpatentable, claims 7, 14, 21, 2-4, 9-11, and 16-18 remain unpatentable.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan D. Schlaifer whose telephone number is (571) 272-4129. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JS



STEPHEN HONG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER